arXiv:1704.08574v1 [math.PR] 27 Apr 2017

# A continuous-time framework for ARMA processes

Andreas Basse-O'Connor, Mikkel Slot Nielsen, Jan Pedersen,
and Victor Rohde
Department of Mathematics
Aarhus University
{basse, mikkel, jan, victor}@math.au.dk

April 28, 2017

**Abstract**

Based on a vast literature on continuous-time moving average processes we suggest an analogue for an autoregressive structure, and from this we combine the two concepts to a model for stationary processes which exhibit an ARMA type behavior. We relate this framework to CARMA processes, and thereby shed light on new aspects of these well-studied processes. Within the model we obtain existence and uniqueness results and study the structure of the solution process. Solutions to general stochastic delay differential equations constitute a particular subclass of these ARMA type processes, and we study these in detail. The results obtained for this subclass go beyond already existing literature.

*Keywords:* continuous-time ARMA model, stochastic delay differential equations, processes of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type, long-range dependence, CARMA processes, moving averages.

## 1 Introduction

Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a two-sided Lévy process and $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ some regular function, and set $\theta_{s,t} = \theta(t-\cdot) - \theta(s-\cdot)$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. Integrals of the form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t} \theta(t-u)\, dL_u, \quad \text{respectively} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{0,t}(u)\, dL_u,$$

have been studied extensively, and if one regards them as stochastic processes indexed by $t \in \mathbb{R}$, they are known as moving averages, respectively stationary increment moving averages. Such processes constitute a large class of stationary, respectively stationary increment, processes. As a particular case of a moving average we have $\theta(u) = e^{-\lambda u}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)$, $\lambda > 0$, which is the Lévy-driven Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. For the stationary increment moving averages, examples are $\theta(u) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)$, recovering the Lévy process itself, and $\theta(u) = u^d\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)$ for some $d \in (-1/2, 1/2)$, resulting in a fractional Lévy process provided that $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is square integrable. In general, properties such as

having long memory and having sample paths of finite variation almost surely or, more generally, being a semimartingale, are well understood. For an extensive treatment of these processes we refer to [4, 5] and references therein.

For a (signed) measure $\phi$ concentrated on $(0,\infty)$ we let $\phi_{s,t} := \phi(t-\cdot) - \phi(s-\cdot)$. Then given a moving average kernel $\theta$, we will put our attention to the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the equations

$$X_t = \int_0^\infty X_{t-u}\,\phi(du) + \int_{-\infty}^t \theta(t-u)\,dL_u \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$X_t - X_s = \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_u\,\phi_{s,t}(du) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u)\,dL_u. \tag{1.2}$$

The idea is that the term

$$\int_0^\infty X_{t-u}\,\phi(du), \quad \text{respectively} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_u \phi_{s,t}(du),$$

can be seen as an autoregressive, respectively increment autoregressive term, and therefore that the models (1.1) and (1.2) may be interpreted as a continuous-time framework for ARMA processes. Besides investigating which specifications of $\phi$ that lead to a stationary solution and when it is unique, we will also be interested in the structure and properties of the solution process.

A parametrization of the autoregressive term in (1.1) is through the measure $\phi(du) = \alpha e^{-\beta u}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)du$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta > 0$ which, under suitable conditions, leads to a modification of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process driven by a stationary noise (see Example 4.4). Another example is $\phi = \sum_{j=1}^p \phi_j \delta_j$, where $\delta_j$ is the Dirac measure at $j$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$, which corresponds to the discrete-time autoregressive term. For the autoregressive term in (1.2), an important subclass is when $\phi$ has a density $f$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure, such that $f$ induces a finite Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure $\eta$. In this case, $\phi_{s,t}(du) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{(s,t]}(u+v)\,\eta(dv)du$, and (1.2) can be written as

$$X_t - X_s = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u)\,dL_u \tag{1.3}$$

for $s < t$. This equation is known as a stochastic delay differential equation (SDDE), and existence and (distributional) uniqueness results have been found when $\eta$ is compactly supported and the noise is a Lévy process (see [14, 16]). The case with a general noise as in (1.3) has, to the best of our knowledge, only been studied in [18]. Another generalization of the noise is given in [22].

Processes covered in (1.3) include Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, which arise by choosing $\eta = -\lambda\delta_0$ for $\lambda > 0$. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes are very desirable building blocks in stochastic modeling, e.g. in stochastic volatility models for option pricing as illustrated in [2] or in models for (log) spot price of many different commodities, see e.g. [25]. Furthermore, in Section 3.2 we will see that under an invertibility assumption, CARMA processes can be seen as solutions to SDDEs, and we thereby get a nice dynamical interpretation of these processes. This result implies that particular sums of dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes can be given as solutions to (1.3) as well. CARMA processes have found

many applications, and extensions to incorporate long memory and to the multivariate case have been made. For more on CARMA processes and their extensions, see [6, 10, 15, 17, 27].

Our proofs rely heavily on the theory of Fourier (and, more generally, bilateral Laplace) transforms, in particular it concerns functions belonging to certain Hardy spaces (or to slight modifications of such). Specific types of Musielak-Orlicz spaces will also play an important role in order to show the results. The implications of the results are readily translated to the model (1.3), and for this reason we believe that our approach provides a parsimonious and well-suited way to analyze SDDEs.

We will briefly present the structure of this paper. In Section 2 we give an existence results for (1.2). Section 3 is concerned with the SDDE in (1.3), where we present an existence result, along with a uniqueness result, and we discuss the structure of the solution more detailed. Moreover, we dedicate a part of this section to an interesting special case (covering its relation to invertible CARMA processes). In Section 3.3 we depart slightly from the ARMA type structure by replacing the increment moving average term by a more general noise. Section 4 focuses on the specification (1.1) and we elaborate on the two examples of the level autoregressive term presented above. Finally, Section 5 contains some technical results together with proofs of all the presented results.

**Definitions and conventions:** For $p \in (0,\infty)$, a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$, and a (non-negative) measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}$, we write $f \in L^p(\mu)$ if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(u)|^p \mu(du) < \infty.$$

For $p = \infty$, $L^p(\mu)$ denotes the space of measurable functions that are bounded almost everywhere. If $\mu$ is the Lebesgue measure, we will suppress the dependence on the measure and write $f \in L^p$. For given $\sigma$-finite measures $\mu^+$ and $\mu^-$ on $\mathbb{R}$, we call the set function $\mu(B) := \mu^+(B) - \mu^-(B)$, defined for any bounded Borel set $B$, an extended signed measure. To such $\mu$ we will associate its variation measure $|\mu| := \mu^+ + \mu^-$. Then we can define the integral of a function $f \in L^1(|\mu|)$ with respect to $\mu$ as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u)\mu(du) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u)\mu^+(du) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u)\mu^-(du).$$

For any given extended signed measure $\mu$, set

$$D(\mu) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \ : \ \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\Re(z)u} |\mu|(du) < \infty \right\}$$

and define the bilateral Laplace transform $\mathcal{L} : D(\mu) \to \mathbb{C}$ of $\mu$ by

$$\mathcal{L}[\mu](z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{zu} \mu(du).$$

We define the Laplace transform of a locally integrable function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\mathcal{L}[f](z) := \mathcal{L}[f(u)du](z)$ for $z \in D(f) := D(f(u)du)$. This definition extends naturally to complex-valued functions. Furthermore the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}$, defined on $L^1 \cup L^2$, is characterized by $\mathcal{F}[f](y) = \mathcal{L}[f](iy)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, for $f \in L^1$. In light of this notation, when $\mu$ is a finite signed measure (that is, $|\mu|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$),

we also write $\mathcal{F}[\mu](y) = \mathcal{L}[\mu](iy)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$. We will typically be interested in Laplace transforms on a strip $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_{a,b} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \,:\, a < \Re(z) < b\}, \quad -\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty,$$

or the closure of such, which is denoted $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{a,b}}$.

For two finite signed measures $\mu$ and $\nu$ we define the convolution $\mu * \nu$ as

$$\mu * \nu(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_B(u+v)\mu(du)\nu(dv)$$

for any Borel set $B$. If $\mu$ is an extended signed measure and $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, we define $f * \mu$ as

$$f * \mu(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t-u)\mu(du)$$

if $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $f(t-\cdot) \in L^1(|\mu|)$ and $f * \mu(t) = 0$ otherwise. In case that $\mu$ is the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure of a function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we will also write $f * g$ instead of $f * \mu$ (not to be confused with the standard convolution between functions). Recall that a process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, $L_0 = 0$, is called a (two-sided) Lévy process if it has stationary and independent increments and cádlág sample paths (for more see e.g. [24]). For a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is integrable with respect to the Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ in the sense of [21], we define the convolution $f * L$ as

$$f * L(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t-u)dL_u$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For an extended signed measure $\phi$ and $s < t$ we define a new extended signed measure by $\phi_{s,t} := \phi(t-\cdot) - \phi(s-\cdot)$. We will say that $\phi_{s,t}$ is a finite measure, whenever there exists a finite signed measure $\mu : \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(B) = \phi_{s,t}(B)$ for any bounded Borel set $B$, and we will identify $\phi_{s,t}$ with $\mu$ on $\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$. Similarly, for a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ we will use the notation $f_{s,t} := f(t-\cdot) - f(s-\cdot)$.

Finally, unless otherwise stated, all measures are understood as extended signed measures and Lévy processes are real-valued and two-sided from this point.

# 2 A general continuous-time ARMA type model

Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be an integrable Lévy process, not identically equal to zero, and $\phi$ a measure on $\mathbb{R}$ concentrated on $(0,\infty)$ which we assume to be well-behaved in the sense that $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0} \subseteq D(\phi)$ and $\phi_{s,t}$ is a finite measure for all $s < t$. Moreover, let $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function, vanishing on $(-\infty, 0)$, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \theta_{0,t}(u)^2\sigma^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x\theta_{0,t}(u)|^2 \wedge |x\theta_{0,t}(u)|\nu(dx) \right) du < \infty, \quad t > 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\nu$ is the Lévy measure and $\sigma^2 \geq 0$ is the Gaussian parameter of $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. The space of functions satisfying the condition (2.1) consists exactly of measurable functions $f$ which are integrable with respect to $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and has $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u)dL_u \in$

$L^1(\mathbb{P})$. It can be seen as a particular type of the so-called Musielak-Orlicz space (for more details on the relation to Musielak-Orlicz spaces and their properties, see [1, 19, 21]).

We will be interested in finding a measurable process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ which is (strictly) stationary, integrable, and satisfies

$$X_t - X_s = \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_u \phi_{s,t}(du) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u) dL_u \tag{2.2}$$

outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set for each $s < t$. We will say that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is causal if, additionally, it is adapted to the filtration

$$\big\{\sigma(L_t - L_s \,:\, -\infty < s < t)\big\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}. \tag{2.3}$$

*Remark* 2.1. Observe that the conditions we impose on a solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ (and thus, on $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\theta$) and $\phi$ ensure that the relation (2.2) is almost surely well-defined. These assumptions are thus very natural and convenient. Of course, one may sometimes use other assumptions; for instance, if $\phi_{s,t}$ is compactly supported for each $s < t$, it suffices that $(X_u)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is cádlág (these is the usual framework in the SDDE literature). This implies in turn that, while we obtain results for very general specifications of $\phi$, we put more restrictions on the integrability of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ than what is necessary. For instance, there exists a (not necessarily integrable) solution to (2.2) under the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck specification $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$ and $\phi(du) = -\lambda \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)du$ with $\lambda > 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[\log^+ |L_1|] < \infty$ (see e.g. [23, Theorem 55]).

In order to formulate our general existence result we will, for a fixed $a < b$, consider analytic functions $f : \mathcal{S}_{a,b} \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying the Hardy type condition (cf. Lemma 5.1)

$$\sup_{a<x<b} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |D_y^p f(x+iy)|^2 dy < \infty \tag{2.4}$$

for a suitable $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Here $D_y^p$ denotes the $p$-times partial derivative with respect to $y$ and $D_y^0 f(x+iy) := f(x+iy)$.

**Theorem 2.2** (Existence)**.** *Suppose that $\mathcal{L}[\phi](z) \neq 1$ for every $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ and some $a < 0$. Then there exists a stationary integrable solution to (2.2) in any of the following two cases:*

*(i) The Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and square integrable, and $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi])$ meets (2.4) with $b = 0$ for $p = 0$.*

*(ii) The Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is integrable and $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ meets (2.4) with $b = 0$ for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$.*

*In either case, the solution is explicitly given by*

$$X_t = \psi * L(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t-u) dL_u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.5}$$

*where $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}[\psi] = \mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi])$ on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. Under (i), $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and square integrable.*

*If $\mathcal{L}[\phi](z) \neq 1$ for every $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ and either (i) or (ii) holds with $a = -\infty$, then $\psi(t) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost all $t < 0$ and, in particular, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ will be causal.*

One may regard the conditions in Theorem 2.2 ensuring existence of a (causal) solution as the continuous-time analogues to the well-known conditions for the existence of a (causal) solution to a discrete-time ARMA process (cf. Example 4.5).

We will give separate uniqueness results for the model (2.2) in Section 3, and Section 4, corresponding to a wide range of interesting choices of $\phi$.

*Remark* 2.3. Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be centered and square integrable and denote by $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ the stationary solution to (2.2) which, by (ii) of Theorem 2.2, is given in (2.5). Then $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is square integrable and its autocovariance function is given by

$$\gamma_X(h) := \mathrm{Cov}(X_{t+h}, X_t) = \mathbb{E}[L_1^2] \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(u+h)\psi(u)du$$

for $h \geq 0$. In particular, by Plancherel's theorem, this shows that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ has a spectral density $f_X$ given by

$$f_X(y) = \mathbb{E}[L_1^2]|\mathcal{F}[\psi](y)|^2$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}$. We will elaborate further on the structure of the spectral density of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ in Proposition 3.9 below in relation to the SDDE setup, since it reveals properties of the memory of the solution process. In particular, we will see how to incorporate long memory.

We will now put more attention on the kernel function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ driving the solution. The following proposition summarizes some properties of $\psi$:

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let $a < 0 \leq b$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ is analytic on $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and (2.4) holds for $p = 0$ and $p = n$. Then there exists a real-valued function $\psi \in L^2$ such that*

$$\psi_{s,t}(r) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(u-r)\phi_{s,t}(du) = \theta_{s,t}(r) \tag{2.6}$$

*holds for Lebesgue almost all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and each $s < t$. Furthermore $t \mapsto t^n e^{ct}\psi(t) \in L^2$ for $c \in [a, b]$ and in particular, $\psi \in L^q$ for all $q \in [1/n, 2]$ when $b = 0$ and for all $q \in (0, 2]$ when $b > 0$.*

*Remark* 2.5. Let $a \leq a' < b' \leq b$. In the formulation of Proposition 2.4 we also refer to the case where $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ is analytic only on $\mathcal{S}_{a',b'}$, but has an analytic continuation to $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ which satisfies the assumptions in Proposition 2.4.

# 3 The SDDE setup

We now turn to our main subclass of (2.2) which consists of SDDEs. Section 3.1 gives existence and uniqueness of solutions to SDDEs. Furthermore, there will be presented some properties of the solution. We show how CARMA models can be seen as SDDEs with exponential delay in Section 3.2. This leads to a state-space representation for SDDEs with exponential delay, which may be useful for statistical inference. We end with Section 3.3 where an existence and uniqueness result for SDDEs with any integrable stationary increment noise is presented.

## 3.1 Existence and uniqueness

Suppose $\phi(du) = f(u)du$, where $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ induces a finite Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure, that is, $f(t) - f(s) = \eta((s,t])$ for $s < t$ and some finite measure $\eta$. Then

$$\phi_{s,t}(du) = [f(t-u) - f(s-u)]du = \int_{[0,\infty)} \mathbb{1}_{(s,t]}(u+v)\,\eta(dv)\,du$$

and consequently, (2.2) can be written as

$$X_t - X_s = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u)\,dL_u \tag{3.1}$$

for $s < t$.

Since (3.1) is a subclass of (2.2) we have, in light of Theorem 2.2, already found a solution to the SDDE. In this section, however, we will impose some moment assumptions on $\eta$, which in turn will imply that we can find solutions to any valid choice of $\theta$ (and even to noises beyond the increment moving averages, cf. Section 3.3). We will say that $\eta$ has $n$-th moment, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} v^n\,|\eta|(dv) < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Similarly, we say that $\eta$ has an exponential moment of order $\delta > 0$, if $v \mapsto e^{\delta v} \in L^1(|\eta|)$. The initial assumption we will make is that the function

$$h(z) := -z - \mathcal{L}[\eta](z), \quad z \in D(\eta), \tag{3.3}$$

is non-zero on the imaginary axis (that is, $h(iy) \neq 0$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$). According to Lemma 3.1 below, this ensures the existence of an autoregressive kernel function. Observe that we have the relation $\phi_{0,1}(\mathbb{R}) = \eta(\mathbb{R})$, thus $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = 0$ if $\phi$ is finite. Therefore, by assuming $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, we have in particular $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = -h(0) \neq 0$ and $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$. We will deal with the case where $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$ in Section 4. Eventually, according to Lemma 3.1 below, we will even suppose that $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$. By continuity of $h$, such an assumption implies that $\eta(\mathbb{R}) < 0$.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a function $x_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, referred to as the autoregressive kernel, which meets $u \mapsto x_0(u)e^{cu} \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, 0]$ and a suitably chosen $a < 0$, and which satisfies*

$$x_0(t) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t) + \int_{-\infty}^t \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\,\eta(dv)\,du \tag{3.4}$$

*for Lebesgue almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, $x_0$ is characterized by*

$$\mathcal{L}[x_0](z) = \frac{1}{h(z)}, \quad z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0},$$

*and the following statements hold:*

*(i) If $\eta$ has $n$-th moment, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in [1/n, \infty]$. In particular,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\,\eta(dv)\,du = -1. \tag{3.5}$$

*(ii) If $\eta$ has an exponential moment of order $\delta > 0$, then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta]$ such that $u \mapsto x_0(u)e^{cu} \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, \varepsilon]$. In particular, $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in (0, \infty]$.*

*(iii) If $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, $x_0(t) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost all $t < 0$.*

We may (and do) choose $x_0$ to satisfy (3.4) pointwise, so that $x_0$ induces a Lebesgue-Stietljes measure, which we will denote by $x_0$ as well. Using the properties given in Lemma 3.1 we get the following structure of $x_0(du)$ (which we state without proof):

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the autoregressive kernel defines a Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure, and it is given by*

$$x_0(du) = \delta_0(du) + \left( \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u - v)\, \eta(dv) \right) du.$$

*A function $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is integrable with respect to $x_0(du)$ if and only if $\theta \in L^1(\mu)$, where $\mu$ is the (non-negative) measure given by*

$$\mu(du) = \int_{[0,\infty)} |x_0(u - v)|\, |\eta|(dv)\, du. \tag{3.6}$$

*In particular, if $\eta$ has $n$-th moment for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x_0(du)$ has moments up to order $n - 1$.*

*Remark* 3.3. Consider the case where $\eta$ is supported on $[0, r]$ for some $r > 0$. Then it is known from the theory of deterministic delay equations (see [11] or [14]) that there exists one and only one function $y : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$y(t) = \begin{cases} 1 + \int_0^t \int_{[0,r]} y(u - v)\, \eta(dv)\, du & \text{if} \quad t \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad t < 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

The equation (3.7) is called the homogeneous equation and $y$ is the associated fundamental solution. Consequently, in light of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, the autoregressive kernel $x_0$ coincides with the fundamental solution $y$ if $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$.

In the literature the equation $h(z) = 0$ is called the characteristic equation associated to the SDDE in (3.1). For a compactly supported $\eta$ it is known that $h$ will have infinitely many roots except in the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck case where $\eta = -\lambda\delta_0$ for some $\lambda > 0$. This will in turn result in a fundamental solution which does not have a closed form expression. For more on SDDEs for a compactly supported $\eta$, see e.g. [14] or [16]. In Section 3.2 we will see that it is indeed possible that $h$ only has a finite number of roots when $\eta$ has unbounded support, and this allows us to obtain explicit expressions for $x_0$. In particular, it is a key property when it comes to matching the kernel functions of the celebrated CARMA processes.

With the autoregressive kernel in hand (both as a function and the associated measure) we present our main result of this section:

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$.*

*(i) If $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is integrable and $\eta$ has second moment then*

$$\theta * x_0(t) = \theta(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta(u) \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(t-u-v)\eta(dv)du$$

*is well-defined for Lebesgue almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and*

$$X_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta * x_0(t-u)dL_u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.8}$$

*is the unique integrable stationary solution (up to modification) to (3.1).*

*(ii) If $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and square integrable, respectively if $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is integrable and $\eta$ has first moment, then*

$$X_t = x_0 * L(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} x_0(t-u)dL_u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

*is centered and square integrable, respectively integrable, and the unique stationary solution (up to modification) to (3.1) with $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$.*

*In either case, if $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, then $\theta * x_0(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$ and in particular, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is causal.*

*Remark* 3.5. Note that, by only considering cases where the autoregressive part meets $h(iy) \neq 0$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta$ has second moment, we do not require more structure on $\theta$ than

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u)dL_u, \quad s < t,$$

is well-defined and integrable (cf. the discussion in the beginning of Section 2) in order to apply Theorem 3.4. In addition, we get a uniqueness result for the solution. Theorem 3.4 and its requirements should be compared to the general existence result in Theorem 2.2. In this comparison, and as already addressed, Theorem 3.4 does, however, not apply when $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$, and when $\phi$ is not absolutely continuous. Of course, due to the uniqueness part, if both Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.4 are applicable, then $\psi = \theta * x_0$.

The expression in (3.8) gives a very intuitive and compact form of the solution to a general SDDE, and is, to the best of our knowledge, not given before.

In the literature on SDDEs, one is (typically) only interested in causal solutions to (3.19), and here the typical assumptions are that $\eta$ is compactly supported and that $h$ has no roots on $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$. In light of these, the restrictions that we impose on $\eta$ seem mild.

However, related to Remark 2.1, if $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$, $\eta$ is compactly supported, and $h$ is non-zero on $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, one only needs that $\mathbb{E}[\log^+ |L_1|] < \infty$ to ensure that (3.19) is well-defined and a stationary solution exists. We refer to [14] and [22] for details.

*Remark* 3.6. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 hold. In many cases, the moving average term arises as increments in a noise process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of the form

$$Z_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\theta(t-u) - \theta_0(-u)]\, dL_u$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and a sufficiently regular function $\theta_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is vanishing on $(-\infty, 0)$. If this is the case, one may rewrite the solution kernel in Theorem 3.4 as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta * x_0(t-r) =& [\theta(t-r) - \theta_0(-r)] \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\theta(t-u-r) - \theta_0(-r)] \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\eta(dv)du\end{aligned}$$

for Lebesgue almost all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Here we have used (3.5). Then, using a stochastic Fubini (see e.g. [1, Theorem 3.1]), it follows that the solution takes the form

$$X_t = Z_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_{t-u} \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\eta(dv)du = Z * x_0(t)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This representation of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ holds, of course, also in the case where $Z_t = \theta * L(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. One should compare the representations to Theorem 3.16, which is presented in Section 3.3.

**Example 3.7** (The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process)**.** Under the assumptions on $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\theta$ imposed in the beginning of Section 2, let $\lambda \neq 0$ and consider the equation

$$X_t - X_s = -\lambda \int_s^t X_u du + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u) dL_u \tag{3.9}$$

for $s < t$. In the setup of (3.1), this corresponds to $\eta = -\lambda\delta_0$. We have $h(z) = \lambda - z \neq 0$ for every $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$ with $x \neq \lambda$, so Theorem 3.4 implies that there exists a stationary and integrable process satisfying (3.9). According to Lemma 3.1 the autoregressive kernel function $x_0$ can be determined through its Laplace transform on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ for a suitable $a < 0$ as

$$\mathcal{L}[x_0](z) = \frac{1}{\lambda - z} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\big[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)} e^{-\lambda \cdot}\big](z) & \text{if} \quad \lambda > 0 \\ \mathcal{L}\big[-\mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,0)} e^{-\lambda \cdot}\big](z) & \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, by Theorem 3.4

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} \theta(t) - \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_{-\infty}^t \theta(u) e^{\lambda u}\, du & \text{if} \quad \lambda > 0 \\ \theta(t) + \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_t^{\infty} \theta(u) e^{\lambda u}\, du & \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0 \end{cases}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If the moving average term is given as in Remark 3.6 for a suitable $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, the solution may as well be written as

$$X_t = \begin{cases} Z_t - \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_{-\infty}^t Z_u e^{\lambda u}\, du & \text{if} \quad \lambda > 0 \\ Z_t + \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_t^{\infty} Z_u e^{\lambda u}\, du & \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes satisfying (3.9) have already been studied in the literature, and representations of the stationary solution have been given, see e.g. [1, Theorem 2.1, Proposition 4.2].

We will now briefly comment on the memory properties of the solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ under the assumptions of Theorem 3.4. Specifically, Proposition 3.9 below is a result regarding the autocovariance structure, and it comments particularly on the fractional noise case. Before formulating the result we do the following observation:

**Lemma 3.8.** *Suppose that $\theta_{0,t} \in L^2$ for some $t > 0$. Then there exists a function $f_\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with $x_n \uparrow 0$, such that*

$$f_\theta(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}[\theta](x_n + iy) \tag{3.11}$$

*for Lebesgue almost all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. This function is unique up to a Lebesgue null set, and if $\theta \in L^1 \cup L^2$ then $f_\theta = \mathcal{F}[\theta]$.*

We will denote by $\Gamma$ the gamma function

$$\Gamma(c) := \int_0^\infty x^{c-1}e^{-x}dx, \quad c > 0,$$

and for functions $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we write $f(y) \sim g(y)$ if $f(y)/g(y) \to 1$ as $y \to 0$.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a centered and square integrable Lévy process with $\sigma^2 := \mathbb{E}[L_1^2] > 0$, let $\theta_{0,t} \in L^2$ for $t > 0$, and denote by $f_\theta$ the function introduced in Lemma 3.8. Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta$ has third moment. Then there exists a unique solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ to (3.1), which is centered and square integrable, and its spectral density $f_X$ satisfies*

$$f_X(y) \sim \frac{\sigma^2}{\eta([0,\infty))^2}|yf_\theta(y)|^2$$

*as $y \to 0$. In particular if $\theta(t) = t^d \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $d \in (0, 1/2)$, then*

$$|f_\theta(y)| = \frac{\Gamma(1+d)}{|y|^{1+d}}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

*so $f_X(y) \to \infty$ as $y \to 0$ and $\gamma_X \notin L^1$.*

*Remark* 3.10. If one regards $f_X(y) \to \infty$, $y \to 0$, as the criterion for long memory we see that, under the assumptions of Proposition 3.9, the autoregressive part is too well-behaved to have any influence on this property, so it has to be induced by the moving average kernel $\theta$ (e.g., by choosing $\theta$ to be a suitable fractional kernel as in the proposition). Specifically, if $|f_\theta(y)y| \to \infty$ then $f_X(y) \to \infty$ (as $y \to 0$), in particular $\gamma_X \notin L^1$.

One may also note that if $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$, we have that $\gamma_X \in L^1$ since $x_0 \in L^1$ by Theorem 3.1. This agrees (of course) also with the fact that $f_X(y) \to \sigma^2/\eta([0,\infty))^2$ as $y \to 0$.

## 3.2 CARMA processes and exponenential delay

This section concerns a specific subclass of (3.1), where $\eta$ takes the form as a sum of (convolutions of) measures, which are absolutely continuous with exponential densities. We will see how such measures connect SDDEs of the form (3.1) to CARMA processes.

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $p > q$. A CARMA$(p, q)$ process is a stationary process $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ that formally satisfies

$$P(D)Y_t = Q(D)DL_t, \tag{3.12}$$

where $D$ denotes differentiation with respect to $t$, and $P(z) = z^p + a_1z^{p-1} + \cdots + a_p$ and $Q(z) = z^q + b_1z^{q-1} + \cdots + b_q$ for some $a_1, \ldots, a_p, b_1, \ldots, b_q \in$

$\mathbb{R}$. Equation (3.12) is made rigorous through a state-space representation. To ensure existence we assume that $P(i\lambda) \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. If it holds that the zeros of $P(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{0,\infty}}$, the CARMA process is causal. It can be shown that $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ may be written on the form

$$Y_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(t-u) dL_u,$$

where $g$ is characterized by

$$\mathcal{L}[g](\lambda) = \frac{Q(-i\lambda)}{P(-i\lambda)}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.13}$$

(The minus in $Q$ and $P$ in (3.13) is due to the difference in the definition of the Fourier transform used here and in the CARMA literature.) For a nice overview of CARMA processes, we refer to [26]. In the following we will say that $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is invertible if it holds that $Q(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{0,\infty}}$. The property that this imposes on the kernel $g$ is also sometimes referred to as the minimum phase property, see e.g. [9].

For $\beta \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ let $\eta_\beta$ be the measure given by $\eta_\beta(dv) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)} e^{\beta v} dv$. Then, for $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{p-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$, we define the measures $\eta_0, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{p-1}$ recursively as $\eta_0 = \delta_0$ and

$$\eta_j = \eta_{j-1} * \eta_{\beta_j}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, p-1$. Then, for given $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{p-1} \in \mathbb{C}$, we set

$$\eta = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \alpha_j \eta_j. \tag{3.14}$$

Next, we let $\theta^\alpha$ be given by

$$\theta^\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} \int_0^t \frac{u^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} e^{-u}\, du & \text{if} \quad \alpha > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad \alpha = 0 \end{cases}$$

for $t > 0$ and $\theta^\alpha(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 0$. With these definitions in hand, we present the following theorem, establishing how invertible CARMA$(p, q)$ processes can be related to SDDEs.

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a CARMA$(p, q)$ process driven by an integrable Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. Assume $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is invertible and let $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_q \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ denote the roots of $Q$. Then*

$$Y_t - Y_s = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} Y_{u-v} \eta(dv) du + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\theta^{p-q-1})_{s,t}(u)\, dL_u \tag{3.15}$$

*almost surely for each $s < t$, where $\eta$ is the (real-valued) measure given by* (3.14) *for suitable $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{p-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\beta_{q+1} = \cdots = \beta_{p-1} = -1$.*

Observe that if $p = q + 1$ then $(\theta^{p-q-1})_{s,t} = \mathbb{1}_{(s,t]}$ for $s < t$. Consequently, Theorem 3.11 implies that, given we have observed an invertible CARMA$(p,p-$

1) process up to a time point $T$, the increments of the underlying Lévy process can be recovered up to time $T$ from the relation

$$L_t - L_s = Y_t - Y_s - \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} Y_{u-v}\, \eta(dv)\, du \tag{3.16}$$

when $s < t \leq T$. In light of this nice property of invertible CARMA$(p, p-1)$ processes it is natural to ask if it also holds for an invertible CARMA$(p, q)$ process with $p > q + 1$. Unless in trivial cases, this is not possible since $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ will be differentiable (see [17, Proposition 3.32]), so the relation (3.16) would imply that $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is differentiable as well. However, when $p > q + 1$ and Theorem 3.11 applies, (3.15) shows that

$$Y_t - Y_s = \int_s^t \left( \int_{[0,\infty)} Y_{u-v}\, \eta(dv) + \int_{-\infty}^u f_{p-q-1}(u-v)\, dL_v \right) du,$$

where

$$f_\alpha(t) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)} \frac{t^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} e^{-t}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.17}$$

denotes the density of a Gamma distribution with shape parameter $\alpha > 0$ and scale parameter 1.

In summary, Theorem 3.11 gives a new way to interpret invertible CARMA processes; they can be seen as solutions to well-behaved SDDEs. This approach has the advantage that it is very intuitive, and the dynamic properties of the CARMA process are clearly stated. We formulate these consequences of Theorem 3.11 in the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be an invertible CARMA$(p, q)$ process driven by an integrable Lévy process and denote by $\eta$ the measure constructed in Theorem 3.11. Then the following statements hold:*

*(i) If $p = q + 1$ then $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is the unique integrable stationary solution to*

$$dY_t = \int_{[0,\infty)} Y_{t-v}\, \eta(dv)\, dt + dL_t.$$

*(ii) If $p > q+1$ then $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is the unique integrable stationary process, which is differentiable and has a derivative $(DY_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ that satisfies*

$$DY_t = Y * \eta(t) + f_{p-q-1} * L(t),$$

*where $f_{p-q-1}$ is the Gamma density given in (3.17).*

In light of their relation to CARMA processes it seems natural to study SDDEs with an autoregressive measure $\eta$ given by (3.14) for some $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{p-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ and $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{p-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\eta$ is a real-valued measure. For such fixed parameters, we associate a matrix, which is denoted $A_p$. If $p = 1$ we associate the constant $A_1 = \alpha_0$, if $p = 2$ the relevant quantity is the $2 \times 2$ matrix given by

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 & 1 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and if $p \geq 3$ the matrix of interest is of size $p \times p$ and it is given by

$$A_p = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & \beta_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \beta_3 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & \beta_{p-1} & 0 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \cdots & \alpha_{p-2} & \alpha_{p-1} & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

With this notation in hand, we can formulate the following result:

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let $\eta$ be given by (3.14) and let the notation be as described above. Assume the eigenvalues of $A_p$ all have negative real part. Then*

$$x_0(t) = e_p^T e^{A_p t} e_p \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

*where $e_p$ is the $p$-th canonical basis vector. In particular, in the pure Lévy case $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$, the solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ to (3.1) has a state-space representation given by*

$$X_t = e_p^T Z_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

*where $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is the stationary $\mathbb{C}^p$-valued process of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type satisfying*

$$dZ_t = A_p Z_t dt + e_p dL_t.$$

*Remark* 3.14. By definition a CARMA process $(Y_t)$ have a state-space representation given by $Y_t = b^T Z_t$ where $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is the stationary $\mathbb{R}^p$-valued process of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type satisfying

$$dZ_t = \tilde{A}_p Z_t dt + e_p dL_t.$$

where the vector $b$ depends on the moving average polynomial $Q$ and $\tilde{A}_p$ depends on the autoregressive polynomial $P$ (see [7] for the precise definition of $b$ and $\tilde{A}_p$). On the other hand, by Theorem 3.11, it now also follows that if $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is invertible, then it has the state-space representation given in Proposition 3.13.

Another observation is that if $\eta$ is given by (3.14) and $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a centered square integrable solution to (3.1) with $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$, then Remark 2.1 and Proposition 3.13 imply that its autocovariance function $\gamma_X$ is given by

$$\gamma_X(h) = \mathbb{E}[L_1^2] e_p^T \exp(A_p h) \Sigma e_p, \quad h \geq 0,$$

where $\Sigma := \int_0^\infty \exp(A_p t) e_p e_p^T \exp(A_p^T t) dt$.

The simplest choice of an $\eta$ of the form (3.14) is for $p = 1$, where $x_0$ is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck kernel. The following example puts attention to the second simplest case $p = 2$ and relate it to the CARMA$(2, 1)$ process:

**Example 3.15.** Consider the case where $\eta(dv) = \alpha_0 \delta_0(dv) + \alpha_1 e^{\beta_1 v} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(v) dv$ for given $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta_1 < 0$. The eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ of

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 & 1 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

are then given by

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\beta_1 + \alpha_0 + \sqrt{(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{\beta_1 + \alpha_0 - \sqrt{(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1}}{2}.$$

These both have negative real part when $\beta_1 + \alpha_0 < 0$ and $(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1 \leq 0$ or when $\beta_1 + \alpha_0 + \sqrt{(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1} < 0$ and $(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1 \geq 0$, and whenever this is the case we can apply Proposition 3.13 to conclude that

$$x_0(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \exp\left( \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 & 1 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix} t \right) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. One can elaborate further on this expression of $x_0$ by the use of explicit formulas for exponentials of $2 \times 2$ matrices to determine $x_0$. In particular, suppose that $(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1 \neq 0$ so that $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$. Then we have

$$x_0(t) = \frac{\lambda_1 - \alpha_0}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} e^{\lambda_2 t} - \frac{\lambda_2 - \alpha_0}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} e^{\lambda_1 t} \tag{3.18}$$

for $t \geq 0$. On the other hand if $(\beta_1 - \alpha_0)^2 + 4\alpha_1 = 0$, but $\beta_1 + \alpha_0 < 0$ still holds, then $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = (\beta + \alpha_0)/2$ and

$$x_0(t) = (1 + \lambda_1 t + \alpha_0 t) e^{\lambda_1 t},$$

for $t \geq 0$. Finally we note that, whenever both $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ have a negative real part,

$$\mathcal{F}[x_0](\lambda) = \frac{-i\lambda - \beta_1}{(-\beta_1 - i\lambda)(-\alpha_0 - i\lambda) - \alpha_1} = \frac{Q(-i\lambda)}{P(-i\lambda)},$$

where $P(z) := z^2 - (\beta_1 + \alpha_0)z + \beta_1\alpha_0 - \alpha_1$ and $Q(z) := z - \beta_1$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$. It follows that $X_t = x_0 * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is not only the unique integrable stationary process that meets

$$X_t - X_s = \alpha_0 \int_s^t X_u du + \alpha_1 \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v} e^{\beta_1 v} dv du + L_t - L_s$$

almost surely for $s < t$, but it is also the CARMA$(2,1)$ process which can be interpreted to formally satisfy

$$D^2 X_t - (\beta_1 + \alpha_0) D X_t + \beta_1\alpha_0 - \alpha_1 = D^2 L_t - \beta_1 D L_t.$$

(Here, as in the introduction, $D$ denotes differentiation with respect to $t$.)

## 3.3 Extending the moving average part

This small section departs slightly from the overall continuous-time ARMA type models presented in (2.2), and thus in (3.1). Indeed, we replace the moving average term

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(u) dL_u$$

by increments $Z_t - Z_s$, $s < t$, of a general measurable process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, which is integrable and has stationary increments (cf. the discussion in Example 3.7). We include this generalized SDDE setup, since it contains some interesting models and, not less important, the techniques used in Theorem 3.4 are, after a few modifications, applicable.

To be specific, given $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ as described above and a finite measure $\eta$, we are searching for a measurable process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ which is stationary, integrable, and which satisfies

$$X_t - X_s = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\eta(dv)du + Z_t - Z_s \tag{3.19}$$

almost surely for each $s < t$. We will say that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is causal if, additionally, it is adapted to the filtration

$$\big\{\sigma(Z_t - Z_s \,:\, -\infty < s < t)\big\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}.$$

Observe that if $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is an integrable Lévy process, Theorem 3.4 implies that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ exists and it is given as $X_t = x_0 * Z(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For a general $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, it is however not clear how this convolution should be interpreted. The idea of Theorem 3.16 below is to circumvent the (possibly) lacking definition of an integral by reversing the order of convolution, that is, to argue that $Z * x_0$ is well-defined and satisfies (3.19).

**Theorem 3.16.** *Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta$ has second moment. Then*

$$Z * x_0(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_{t-u}x_0(du) = Z_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_u \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(t-u-v)\eta(dv)du$$

*is well-defined almost surely for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X_t = Z * x_0(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is the unique (up to modification) integrable and stationary solution to (3.19).*

*If, in addition, $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$ then $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is causal.*

*Remark* 3.17. As already stressed, finding the stationary solution to (3.19) is a matter of defining the convolution $Z * x_0$ or $x_0 * Z$ in a suitable manner. Theorem 3.16 exploits the fact that $Z * x_0$ can be defined if $u \mapsto x_0(u)$ induces a measure that has first moment. If $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is stationary itself, it is sufficient that $u \mapsto x_0(u)$ induces a finite measure, which in turn only requires that $\eta$ has first moment. Another example is the case where $\eta$ has no moments (and it only holds that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$), but $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and square integrable. Then, one can instead define integration with respect to $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ through its spectral process, and since $1/|h(iy)|$ is bounded on compact intervals and $1/|h(iy)| \sim |y|^{-1}$ as $|y| \to \infty$, $x_0 * Z(t)$ is well-defined for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then one may, once again, apply a stochastic Fubini result to deduce that this convolution is a (weakly) stationary solution to (3.19). For more on spectral theory for square integrable stationary increment processes, see e.g. [3].

We will end this section by an example of a setup which is contained in Theorem 3.16, but not in the earlier presented results. The example is closely related to [1, Corollary 2.3].

**Example 3.18.** Denote by $\mathscr{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ the underlying filtration, let $(B_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be an $\mathscr{F}$-Brownian motion, and let $(\sigma_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be predictable. Assume that $(\sigma_t, B_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \overset{\mathscr{D}}{=} (\sigma_{t+u}, B_{t+u} - B_u)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ (that is, the two processes have the same finite-dimensional marginal distributions) for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and that $\sigma_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{P})$. In this case,

$$Z_t = \int_0^t \sigma_s dB_s, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

is well-defined, continuous and square integrable, and it has stationary increments. (Here we use the convention $\int_0^t := -\int_t^0$ when $t < 0$.) Under the assumptions that $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$ and $\eta$ has second moment, Theorem 3.16 implies that there exists a unique stationary solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ to (3.19) and, since $x_0(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$, it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= Z_t + \int_0^\infty Z_{t-u} \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\eta(dv)du \\ &= -\int_{-\infty}^t \sigma_s \int_{t-s}^\infty \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\eta(dv)du dB_s \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t \sigma_s x_0(t-s)dB_s \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where we have used Lemma 3.2 and an extension of the stochastic Fubini given in [20, Chapter IV, Theorem 65] to integrals over unbounded intervals.

# 4 The level model

In this section we consider the case where $\phi$ (rather than only $\phi_{s,t}$) is a finite measure and $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, vanishing on $(-\infty, 0)$, satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \theta(u)^2\sigma^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x\theta(u)|^2 \wedge |x\theta(u)|\nu(dx) \right) du < \infty.$$

As addressed in Section 3, if $\phi(du) = f(u)du$, where $f \in L^1$ induces a finite Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure $\eta$, then we necessarily have that $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = 0$ and $h(0) = 0$. Consequently, this situation was not handled in the above section.

Instead of solving the general increment equation in (2.2), we can now consider the level equation

$$X_t = X * \phi(t) + \theta * L(t) = \int_0^\infty X_{t-u}\phi(du) + \int_{-\infty}^t \theta(t-u)dL_u \tag{4.1}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, it would be natural to search for an integrable and stationary process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ that meets (4.1) almost surely for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Equation (4.1) has the advantage that it can be solved using the backward recursion method under suitable assumptions, and this is how we obtain Theorem 4.1 below. In the formulation we will denote by $\phi^{*n}$ the $n$-fold convolution of $\phi$, that is, $\phi^{*n} := \phi * \cdots * \phi$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi^{*0} = \delta_0$.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a centered and square integrable Lévy process, $\theta \in L^2$, and $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) < 1$. Then there exists a unique square integrable solution to (4.1). It is given by $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where*

$$\psi := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \theta * \phi^{*n}$$

*exists as a limit in $L^2$, is real-valued, and vanishing on $(-\infty, 0)$. Consequently, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is causal.*

One can naturally argue for the existence of solutions to (4.1) beyond Theorem 4.1. By applying the Laplace transform, one verifies that the solution kernel $\psi \in L^2$ obtained in Section 2 satisfies

$$\psi(t-r) = \int_0^\infty \psi(t-u-r)\phi(du) + \theta(t-r)$$

for Lebesgue almost all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ for each fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, by a stochastic Fubini result and under suitable assumptions on $\psi$ and $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, the process $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, defines an integrable stationary solution to (4.1). From this reasoning and Theorem 2.2, the following result is an immediate consequence:

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that $a < 0$ is given such that $\mathcal{L}[\phi](z) \neq 1$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. Then there exists a stationary solution to (4.1) in any of the following two cases:*

*(i) The Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and square integrable, and $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ meets (2.4) with $b = 0$ for $p = 0$.*

*(ii) The Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is integrable and $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ meets (2.4) with $b = 0$ for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$.*

*The solution is explicitly given by $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}[\psi] = \mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$.*

*If $\mathcal{L}[\phi] \neq 1$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ and either (i) or (ii) holds with $a = -\infty$, then $\psi(t) = 0$ for almost all $t < 0$ and $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ will be causal.*

*Remark* 4.3. It is likely that, under suitable assumptions, one can obtain uniqueness in a greater generality than when $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) < 1$. E.g. in the square integrable case it may very well be possible to exploit the fact that both $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ admit a spectral representation (as a stationary, respectively stationary increment, process) to conclude uniqueness of a solution.

**Example 4.4** (Exponential measure)**.** Consider $\phi(du) = \alpha e^{-\beta u}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)du$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta \geq 0$. (Note that, initially, we allow $|\phi|(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$, so we are not in the setup of (4.1).) Suppose that $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is square integrable Lévy procees with $\mathbb{E}[L_1] = 0$ and $\theta \in L^2$, and set $Z_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta(t-u)dL_u$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then if $\alpha \neq \beta$, Theorem 2.2 ensures that there exists a stationary solution to (2.2) given by

$$X_t = \begin{cases} Z_t - \alpha e^{-(\alpha+\beta)t}\int_{-\infty}^t Z_u e^{(\alpha+\beta)u}du & \text{if} \quad \alpha+\beta > 0 \\ Z_t + \alpha e^{-(\alpha+\beta)t}\int_t^\infty Z_u e^{(\alpha+\beta)u}du & \text{if} \quad \alpha+\beta < 0 \end{cases}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\alpha + \beta = 0$, $\phi(\mathbb{R}) = 1$ and therefore $1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi](z) \to 0$ as $z \to 0$ and, in view of Theorem 2.2, this is a critical case. By imposing the additional assumption that $u \mapsto \Theta(u) := \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(u) \int_0^u \theta(v)dv \in L^2$, Theorem 2.2 is still applicable and

$$X_t = Z_t - \alpha \int_{-\infty}^{t} \Theta(t-u)dL_u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

is a solution to (2.2). By Theorem 4.2, it follows that the solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ constructed in the above cases does not only satisfy (2.2) but also (4.1), whenever $\phi$ is a finite measure, that is, for $\beta > 0$. Note that the case $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta = 0$ corresponds to an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (cf. [1] or Example 3.7).

A nice property of the model (4.1) is that it can recover the discrete-time ARMA($p$,$q$) model. Example 4.5 gives (well-known) results for ARMA processes by using Theorem 4.2. For an extensive treatment of ARMA processes, see e.g. [8].

**Example 4.5** (Discrete-time ARMA process in a continuous-time framework)**.** Let $p, q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and define the polynomials $\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta} : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}(z) = 1 - \phi_1 z - \cdots - \phi_p z^p \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}(z) = 1 + \theta_1 z + \cdots + \theta_q z^q,$$

where the coefficients are assumed to be real. Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a centered and square integrable Lévy process, and consider choosing $\phi(du) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \phi_j \delta_j(du)$ and $\theta(u) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)}(u) + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \theta_j \mathbb{1}_{[j,j+1)}(u)$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| = 1$. Then, by continuity of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, there exists $a < 0$ such that $1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi](z) = \boldsymbol{\phi}(e^z)$ is strictly separated from 0 for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. Thus, since $\theta \in L^2$ as well, Theorem 4.2 implies that there exists a centered and square integrable stationary solution to (4.1), and it is given by $X_t = \psi * L(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{L}[\psi] = \mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi])$ on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. Choose $(\psi_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $z \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(z)/\boldsymbol{\phi}(z)$ can be written as the (absolutely convergent) Laurent series

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\theta}(z)}{\boldsymbol{\phi}(z)} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j z^j$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $1 - \varepsilon < |z| < 1 + \varepsilon$ for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}[\psi](z) = \mathcal{L}[\mathbb{1}_{[0,1)}](z)\frac{\boldsymbol{\theta}(e^z)}{\boldsymbol{\phi}(e^z)} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j \mathcal{L}[\mathbb{1}_{[j,j+1)}](z) = \mathcal{L}\Big[\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j \mathbb{1}_{[j,j+1)}\Big](z)$$

for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ with $1-\varepsilon < |z| < 1+\varepsilon$. Thus, if we set $Z_t = L_t - L_{t-1}$, we conclude that $X_t = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j Z_{t-j}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

If we even have that $\boldsymbol{\phi}(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| \leq 1$, Theorem 4.1 is applicable with $a = -\infty$, implying that $\psi(u) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost all $u < 0$, which in turn gives that $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j Z_{t-j}$. Under any of the assumptions on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, since $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is stationary and satisfies (4.1), $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary and satisfies

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \phi_i X_{t-i} + Z_t + \sum_{i=1}^{q} \theta_i Z_{t-i}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other words, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is an ARMA($p$,$q$) process.

# 5 Proofs and technical results

The first result is closely related to the characterization of the so-called Hardy spaces. For more on this topic, see e.g. [12] or [13, Section 2.3].

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$. Suppose that $F : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a function which is analytic on the strip $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and satisfies*

$$\sup_{a<x<b} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F(x+iy)|^2 dy < \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

*Then there exists a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{a,b} \subseteq D(f)$, $\mathcal{L}[f](z) = F(z)$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,b}$, and $u \mapsto f(u)e^{cu} \in L^2$ for all $a \leq c \leq b$.*

*Remark* 5.2. If $a = -\infty$, the property $u \mapsto f(u)e^{au} \in L^2$ is understood as $f(u) = 0$ for almost all $u < 0$ and similarly, $f(u) = 0$ for almost all $u > 0$ if $u \mapsto f(u)e^{bu} \in L^2$ for $b = \infty$.

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* Fix $c_1, c_2 \in (a, b)$ with $c_1 < c_2$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $y > 0$, consider (anti-clockwise) integration of $F$ along a rectangular contour $R_y$ with vertices $c_1 - iy$, $c_2 - iy$, $c_2 + iy$, and $c_1 + iy$:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \oint_{R_y} e^{-zu} F(z) dz \\ &= \int_{c_1}^{c_2} e^{-(x-iy)u} F(x-iy) dx + ie^{-c_2 u} \int_{-y}^{y} e^{-ixu} F(c_2 + ix) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{c_1}^{c_2} e^{-(x+iy)u} F(x+iy) dx - ie^{-c_1 u} \int_{-y}^{y} e^{-ixu} F(c_1 + ix) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

For $k = 1, 2$ it holds that

$$\left( u \mapsto \int_{-y}^{y} e^{-ixu} F(c_k + ix) dx \right) \to \left( u \mapsto 2\pi \mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(c_k + i\cdot)](u) \right) \tag{5.3}$$

in $L^2$ as $y \to \infty$. Furthermore, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{c_1}^{c_2} e^{-(x+iy)u} F(x+iy) dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\qquad \leq e^{-2(c_1 u \wedge c_2 u)} (c_2 - c_1)^2 \sup_{a<x<b} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F(x+iy)|^2 dy < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

From these observations we deduce the existence of a sequence $(y_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq (0, \infty)$ with $y_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\int_{c_1}^{c_2} e^{-(x \pm iy_n)u} F(x \pm iy_n) dx \to 0$$

and (5.3) holds along $(y_n)_{n \geq 1}$ for almost all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ as $n \to \infty$. Combining this with (5.2) yields $e^{-c_1 u} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(c_1 + i\cdot)](u) = e^{-c_2 u} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(c_2 + i\cdot)](u)$ for almost all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, there exists a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ with the property

that $f(u) = e^{-cu}\mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(c+i\cdot)](u)$ for almost all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ for any given $c \in (a,b)$. For such $c$ we compute

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |e^{cu} f(u)|^2 du = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(c+i\cdot)](u)|^2 du \leq \sup_{x\in(a,b)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F(x+iy)|^2 dy < \infty.$$

Consequently, $u \mapsto e^{cu} f(u) \in L^2$ for any $c \in (a,b)$ and by the monotone convergence theorem, this holds as well for $c = a$ and $c = b$. Furthermore, if $c \in (a,b)$, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $c \pm \varepsilon \in (a,b)$ as well, from which we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(u)| e^{cu} du\Big)^2 \\ &\quad \leq \Big(\int_0^\infty |f(u) e^{(c+\varepsilon)u}|^2 du + \int_{-\infty}^0 |f(u) e^{(c-\varepsilon)u}|^2 du\Big) \int_0^\infty e^{-2\varepsilon u} du < \infty\end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality. This shows that $\mathcal{S}_{a,b} \subseteq D(f)$. Finally, we find for $z = x + iy \in \mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ (by definition of $f$) that

$$\mathcal{L}[f](z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iyu} e^{xu} f(u) du = \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{F}^{-1}[F(x+i\cdot)]](y) = F(z),$$

and this completes the proof. □

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be an integrable Lévy process and suppose that $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function in $L^1 \cap L^2$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(s) dL_s$$

*is well-defined and belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{P})$.*

*Proof.* Since $f \in L^1 \cap L^2$, we may proceed under the assumptions that $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is centered and has no Gaussian component. Let $\nu$ be the Lévy measure of $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and note that $\int_{\{|x|>1\}} |x|\nu(dx) < \infty$ by assumption. According to [21, Theorem 3.3] it is enough to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big(|f(u)x|^2 \wedge |f(u)x|\Big) \nu(dx)\, du < \infty. \tag{5.4}$$

To verify (5.4), we decompose (5.4) as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big(|f(u)x|^2 \wedge |f(u)x|\Big) \nu(dx) = f_1(u) + f_2(u),$$

where $f_1(u) := \int_{\{|xf(u)|\leq 1\}} |f(u)x|^2 \, \nu(dx)$ and $f_2(u) := \int_{\{|xf(u)|>1\}} |f(u)x| \, \nu(dx)$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$. We obtain the following estimate on $f_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(u) &\leq \Big(\int_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} x^2 \, \nu(dx)\Big) |f(u)|^2 + |f(u)|^2 \int_{\{|x|>1,\, |xf(u)|\leq 1\}} x^2 \, \nu(dx) \\ &\leq \Big(\int_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} x^2 \, \nu(dx)\Big) |f(u)|^2 + |f(u)|^2 \int_{\{|x|>1,\, |xf(u)|\leq 1\}} |x||f(u)|^{-1} \, \nu(dx) \\ &\leq C\Big(|f(u)|^2 + |f(u)|\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where

$$C := \int_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} x^2\,\nu(dx) + \int_{\{|x|>1\}} |x|\,\nu(dx) < \infty. \tag{5.6}$$

Next, we estimate $f_2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(u) &= \int_{\{|x|\leq 1,\,|xf(u)|>1\}} |f(u)x|\,\nu(dx) + \int_{\{|x|>1,\,|xf(u)|>1\}} |f(u)x|\,\nu(dx) \\ &\leq |f(u)|^2 \int_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} x^2\,\nu(dx) + |f(u)| \int_{\{|x|>1\}} |x|\,\nu(dx) \\ &\leq C\Big(|f(u)|^2 + |f(u)|\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

with $C$ given in (5.6). Hence, (5.4) follows by (5.5) and (5.7). □

*Proof of Theorem 2.2.* We have that $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0} \subseteq D(\phi)$ by assumption, but we need to argue that $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0} \subseteq D(\theta)$ as well. Fix $\beta > 0$ and define the $\mu(du) = e^{-\beta u}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(u)du$. Observe that if $L_t = \gamma t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $\gamma \neq 0$, then $\theta_{0,u} \in L^1$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition, $\|\theta_{0,v+u} - \theta_{0,w+u}\|_{L^1} = \|\theta_{0,v} - \theta_{0,w}\|_{L^1}$ for all $u, v, w \in \mathbb{R}$, so $u \mapsto \|\theta_{0,u}\|_{L^1}$ has at most linear growth, see e.g. [1, Theorem A.1]. (Here $\|\cdot\|_{L^1}$ denotes the usual norm on $L^1$.) Thus, we may choose $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\theta_{0,u}(t)|\mu(du)dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\theta_{0,u}\|_{L^1}\mu(du) \leq c_1\mu(\mathbb{R}) + c_2\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u|\mu(du) < \infty.$$

This shows in turn that $u \mapsto \theta_{0,u}(t) \in L^1(\mu)$ for (Lebesgue) almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For such $t > 0$ we thus have that

$$\infty > \int_t^\infty |\theta(u-t)|\mu(du) = e^{-\beta t}\int_0^\infty |\theta(u)|e^{-\beta u}du,$$

from which we deduce that $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0} \subseteq D(\theta)$. If $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is non-degenerate, either its Lévy measure $\nu$ or its Gaussian parameter $\sigma^2$ is non-zero. Consequently, the condition (2.1) is non-trivial and it holds for $\theta_{0,u}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. As already addressed in Section 2, the space of measurable functions satisfying (2.1) is a Musielak-Orlicz space. We equip the space with its associated Luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}}$ (for the definition, see [1] or references therein). By arguments as above it follows that $u \mapsto \|\theta_{0,u}\|_{\mathcal{M}}$ has at most linear growth, and this implies

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\theta_{0,u}|\mu(du) \right\|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\theta_{u,0}\|_{\mathcal{M}}\mu(du) < \infty,$$

using [1, Lemma 3.3]. This can only happen if $u \mapsto \theta_{0,u}(t) \in L^1(\mu)$ for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, so we may proceed as in the above case and conclude that $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0} \subseteq D(\theta)$.

Next, observe that the assumption $\mathcal{L}[\phi](z) \neq 1$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ is analytic on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. If either (i) or (ii) holds, (2.4) is satisfied with $b = p = 0$, so it follows from Proposition 2.4 that there exists a real-valued function $\psi \in L^2$ such that the functional relation (2.6) holds almost everywhere for each $s < t$.

If we are under assumption (i), then $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is a well-defined stationary and square integrable process. Moreover, a stochastic Fubini result (e.g., [1, Theorem 3.1]) and (2.6) gives

$$X_t - X_s - \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_u\phi_{s,t}(du) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\psi_{s,t}(r) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(u-r)\phi_{s,t}(du)\right] dL_r = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{s,t}(r)dL_r$$

and thus, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ meets (2.2). Instead, if (ii) holds, Proposition 2.4 ensures that $\psi \in L^1 \cap L^2$ so $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is a well-defined (stationary) integrable process according to Lemma 5.3.

Finally, if $a = -\infty$, the causality follows from Remark 5.2. □

*Proof of Proposition 2.4.* We disregard the case mentioned in Remark 2.5, since the arguments are more or less the same. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1-\mathcal{L}[\phi])$ is analytic on $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and meets (2.4) with $p = 0$. Then, by Lemma 5.1, there exists $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathcal{L}[\psi] = \mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi])$ on $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and $\psi \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, b]$. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{L}[\psi](\overline{z})} = \mathcal{L}[\psi](z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and $\psi$ is real-valued. Moreover, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}[t \mapsto t^n\psi(t)](x + iy) = i^{-n}D_y^n\mathcal{L}[\psi](x + iy) = i^{-n}D_y^n\frac{\mathcal{L}[\theta](x + iy)}{1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi](x + iy)}$$

for $x + iy \in \mathcal{S}_{a,b}$. Consequently, since (2.4) holds for $p = n$, we can apply Lemma 5.1 once again to deduce that $t \mapsto t^n e^{ct}\psi(t) \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, b]$. Continuing in this way, we get that $t \mapsto t^p e^{ct}\psi(t) \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, b]$ for $p = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. In particular $t \mapsto \psi(t)(1 + |t|)^n \in L^2$, so if $q \in [1/n, 2)$, Hölder's inequality implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(t)|^q \, dt \leq \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\psi(t)(1 + |t|)^n\big)^2 \, dt \Big)^{q/2} \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + |t|)^{-2/(2-q)} \, dt \Big)^{1-q/2} < \infty.$$

Fix $q \in (0, 2)$. By choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $-\varepsilon/q \geq a$ it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(t)|^q \, dt \leq \Big( \int_{-\infty}^{0} (\psi(t)e^{-\varepsilon t/q})^2 \, dt \Big)^{q/2} \Big( \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{2\varepsilon t/(2-q)} \, dt \Big)^{1-q/2} < \infty.$$

If $b > 0$, we may choose $\varepsilon$ such that $\varepsilon/q \leq b$ and repeat the computations to show that $\int_0^\infty |\psi(t)|^q < \infty$. In this case, we thus conclude that $\psi \in L^q$ for any $q \in (0, 2]$. Finally, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}\Big[\psi_{s,t} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(u - \cdot)\phi_{s,t}(du)\Big](z) &= (e^{zt} - e^{zs} - \mathcal{L}[\phi_{s,t}](z))\mathcal{L}[\psi](-z) \\ &= (e^{zt} - e^{zs})(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi](-z))\mathcal{L}[\psi](-z) \\ &= \mathcal{L}[\theta_{s,t}](z)\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in -\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ and any $s < t$, which shows that (2.6) holds. □

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* Observe that, generally, $h(z) \neq 0$ if $|z| > |\eta|(\mathbb{R})$, and thus, under the assumption that $h(iy) \neq 0$ and by continuity of $h$ there must be an $a < 0$ such that $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. The fact that $|h(z)| \sim |z|$ as $|z| \to \infty$ and, once again, the continuity of $h$ imply that (2.4) is satisfied for $1/h$ with $b = p = 0$. Fubini's theorem yields that

$$\frac{1}{h} = \frac{\mathcal{L}[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}]}{1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi]}$$

on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. By Proposition 2.4 we thus get the existence of a function $x_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{L}[x_0] = 1/h$ on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ and $t \mapsto e^{ct}x_0(t) \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, 0]$. Observe that this gives in particular that $x_0\mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,0]} \in L^1$ and thus, since $x_0 \in L^2$, we

also get that $x_0 \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,t]} \in L^1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The relation (2.6) in the proposition implies as well that $x_0$ meets

$$x_0(t-r) - x_0(s-r) = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v-r)\eta(dv)du + \mathbb{1}_{(s,t]}(r)$$

for almost all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ for each $s < t$. We may now let $s \to -\infty$ and use Lebesgue's theorem on dominated convergence to obtain (3.4).

Suppose that (i) holds. Then, for $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$|D_y^k h(x+iy) \leq 1 + \int_{[0,\infty)} v^k |\eta|(dv) < \infty$$

for all $x + iy \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$, so we deduce that (2.4) is satisfied for $p = n$, and Proposition 2.4 thus implies $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in [1/n, 2]$. Moreover, (3.4) shows $\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} |x_0(t)| \leq 1 + |\eta|(\mathbb{R})\|x_0\|_{L^1} < \infty$, so $x_0 \in L^\infty$ and we deduce that $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in [1/n, \infty]$. Since $x_0 \in L^1$ and the right-hand side of (3.4) will indeed converge as $t \to \infty$, it must converge to 0. This shows (3.5).

Suppose that $\eta$ has an exponential moment of order $\delta > 0$ so that $h$ is defined on $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,\delta} \subseteq D(\eta)$. Then, note that $h(z)$ is strictly separated from 0 for $|z|$ sufficiently large (e.g., for $|z| > 1 + \int_{[0,\infty)} e^{\delta v}|\eta|(dv)$). Using this together with the continuity of $h$, we can even find a small strip $\mathcal{S}_{0,\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta]$, such that $h(z)$ is strictly separated from 0 when $z \in \mathcal{S}_{0,\varepsilon}$. When we argued for the existence of $x_0$, we used similar properties on $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. Thus, since $|h(z)| \sim |z|$ as $|z| \to \infty$, we can apply Proposition 2.4 with $b = \varepsilon$ to conclude that $t \mapsto e^{ct}x_0(t) \in L^2$ for all $c \in [a, \varepsilon]$ and $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in (0, 2]$. In particular $x_0 \in L^1$, and the argument in point (i) that $x_0 \in L^\infty$ holds. In conclusion, $x_0 \in L^q$ for all $q \in (0, \infty]$.

Finally, if $h$ is non-zero on $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, the continuity of $h$ implies that $1/h$ is bounded on compact subsets of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$. Using this together with the property $|h(z)| \sim |z|$ for $|z| \to \infty$, Lemma 5.1 applies with $a = -\infty$. From Remark 5.2 we deduce that $x_0$ vanishes on $(-\infty, 0)$ almost everywhere. □

The following lemma is used to ensure uniqueness of our solutions in Section 3:

**Lemma 5.4.** *Fix $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and that, given $(Y_t)_{t\leq s}$, a process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_s + \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\eta(dv)du, \quad t \geq s \\ X_t &= Y_t, \quad t < s \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

*for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ almost surely and has bounded first moments (that is, $\mathbb{E}[|X_t|] \leq c$ for some $c > 0$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$). Then*

$$X_t = X_s x_0(t-s) + \int_s^\infty \int_{(u-s,\infty)} Y_{u-v}\, \eta(dv)\, x_0(t-u)\, du \tag{5.9}$$

*for Lebesgue almost all $t \geq s$ outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set.*

*Proof.* Observe, by Fubini's theorem, we can remove a $\mathbb{P}$-null set and have that (5.8) is satisfied for Lebesgue almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $a < 0$ be such that $h(z) \neq 0$

for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ (this is possible due to the assumption $h(iy) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$). For such $z$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}[X\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}](z) =& \mathcal{L}\left[\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}\left\{X_s + \int_s^{\cdot}\int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du\right\}\right](z) \\
=& -\frac{X_s e^{zs}}{z} + \int_s^{\infty} e^{zt}\int_s^t\int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du\,dt \\
=& -\frac{1}{z}\left(X_s e^{zs} + \int_{[0,\infty)}\int_{s-v}^{\infty} X_u e^{z(u+v)}\,du\,\eta(dv)\right) \\
=& -\frac{1}{z}\Bigg(X_s e^{zs} + \mathcal{L}[\eta](z)\mathcal{L}[X\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}](z) \\
&+\mathcal{L}\left[\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}\int_{(\cdot-s,\infty)} Y_{\cdot-v}\,\eta(dv)\right](z)\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives that

$$\mathcal{L}[X\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}](z) = \frac{X_s e^{zs}}{h(z)} + \frac{\mathcal{L}\left[\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}\int_{(\cdot-s,\infty)} Y_{\cdot-v}\,\eta(dv)\right](z)}{h(z)}. \tag{5.10}$$

Since $Y$ has bounded first moments, $\int_s^{\infty}\int_{(u-s,\infty)} |Y_{u-v}|\,|\eta|(dv)\,|x_0(t-u)|\,du$ is almost surely finite by Lemma 3.1, and Fubini's theorem gives that it is finite for Lebesgue almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set. Furthermore, again by Lemma 3.1, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\varepsilon t}\int_s^{\infty} |x_0(t-u)|\,du\,dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\varepsilon t}|x_0(t)|\,dt\int_s^{\infty} e^{-\varepsilon u}\,du < \infty.$$

From this it follows that almost surely $\int_s^{\infty}\int_{(u-s,\infty)} Y_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,x_0(t-u)\,du$ is well-defined and that its Laplace transform exists on $\mathcal{S}_{-\varepsilon,0}$. We conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}\left[\int_s^{\infty}\int_{(u-s,\infty)} Y_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,x_0(\cdot-u)\,du\right](z) = \frac{\mathcal{L}\left[\mathbb{1}_{[s,\infty)}\int_{(\cdot-s,\infty)} Y_{\cdot-v}\,\eta(dv)\right](z)}{h(z)},$$

for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\varepsilon,0}$, and the result follows since we also have $\mathcal{L}[x_0(\cdot-s)](z) = e^{zs}/h(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\varepsilon,0}$. □

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* We start by noting that if $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ are two integrable measurable solutions to (3.1) then, for fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$U_t = U_s + \int_s^t\int_{[0,\infty)} U_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du \tag{5.11}$$

almost surely for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, when we set $U_t := X_t - Y_t$. Particularly, for a given $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get by Lemma 5.4,

$$U_r = U_s x_0(r-s) + \int_s^{\infty}\int_{(u-s,\infty)} U_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,x_0(r-u)\,du \tag{5.12}$$

for Lebesgue almost all $r > t-1$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $s \leq t-1$. For any such $r$ we observe that the right-hand side of (5.12) tends to zero in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ as $\mathbb{Q} \ni s \to -\infty$, from which we deduce $U_r = 0$ or, equivalently, $X_r = Y_r$ almost surely. By continuity of $(U_r)_{r\in\mathbb{R}}$ in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ (see e.g., [1, Corollary A.3]), we get that $X_t = Y_t$ almost surely as well. This shows that a solution to (3.1) is unique up to modification.

To prove (i), let $\mu$ be the measure defined in (3.6) and note that arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 imply that $\|\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\theta_{0,-u}(-\cdot)|\mu(du)\|_{\mathcal{M}} < \infty$, since $\mu$ has first moment when $\eta$ has second moment according to Lemma 3.2. Unless $(L_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is degenerate, this can only happen if $u \mapsto \theta_{0,-u}(t) \in L^1(\mu)$ for Lebesgue almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies in turn that $\theta(t-\cdot) \in L^1(\mu)$ and $\theta * x_0(t)$ is well-defined by Lemma 3.2. Since

$$\theta * x_0(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{0,-u}(-t) \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\eta(dv)du,$$

the condition $\|\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\theta_{0,-u}(-\cdot)|\mu(du)\|_{\mathcal{M}} < \infty$ shows as well that $X_t = (\theta * x_0) * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is a well-defined, stationary, and integrable process. By applying the Laplace transform (on the strip $\mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ where $a < 0$ is chosen as in Lemma 3.1) it follows that

$$(\theta * x_0)_{s,t}(r) = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} \theta * x_0(u-v-r)\eta(dv)du + \theta_{s,t}(r)$$

for each $s < t$ and almost all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, thus a stochastic Fubini result yields that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ meets (3.1).

If (ii) holds, then it follows from Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 3.1 that $x_0 * L$ is a solution to (3.1) with $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$. □

*Proof of Lemma 3.8.* Observe that

$$\mathcal{F}[\theta_{0,t}](-\cdot) = \lim_{x\uparrow 0} \mathcal{L}[\theta_{0,t}](-(x+i\cdot)) = \lim_{x\uparrow 0} (e^{-(x+i\cdot)t} - 1)\mathcal{L}[\theta](x+i\cdot), \quad (5.13)$$

where the limits are in $L^2$. From this it follows that, along a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with $x_n \uparrow 0$, for Lebesgue almost all $y$, not a multiple of $2\pi/t$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}[\theta](x_n + iy) = \frac{\mathcal{F}[\theta_{0,t}](-y)}{e^{-ity} - 1}. \quad (5.14)$$

Thus, we get the existence of $f_\theta$. If $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}[\theta](\tilde{x}_n + iy)$ exists for almost all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ along another sequence $(\tilde{x}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with $\tilde{x}_n \uparrow 0$ it must, due to (5.13), be equal to the right-hand side of (5.14) almost everywhere. Finally if $\theta \in L^1$, respectively $\theta \in L^2$, $\mathcal{L}[\theta](x_n + i\cdot) \to \mathcal{F}[\theta]$ pointwise, respectively in $L^2$, and uniqueness of limits implies that $f_\theta = \mathcal{F}[\theta]$. If $\theta(t) = t^d \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $d \in (0, 1/2)$ then $|\mathcal{L}[\theta](z)| = \Gamma(1+d)/|z|^{1+d}$, so the structure of $|f_\theta|$ stated in the result is immediate. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.9.* The fact that there exists a unique (centered) stationary integrable solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ to (3.1) follows from Theorem 3.4, and it takes the form $X_t = (\theta * x_0) * L(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $u \mapsto \|\theta_{0,-u}\|_{L^2}$ has at most linear drift and $\mu$ defined in (3.6) has second moment, we get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta * x_0(t)^2\, dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\theta_{0,-u}(t)\, \mu(du)\Big)^2 dt \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\theta_{0,-u}\|_{L^2}^2\, \mu(du) < \infty.$$

This shows that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is square integrable as well. Observe that, since $\mathcal{L}[\theta * x_0](z) = -z\mathcal{L}[\theta](z)/h(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$ and suitable $a < 0$, it holds for Lebesgue almost all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\mathcal{F}[\theta * x_0](y) = -iyf_\theta(y)/h(iy)$. As noted in Remark 2.3, the spectral density $f_X$ of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is given by

$$f_X(y) = \sigma^2|\mathcal{F}[\theta * x_0](y)|^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{|h(iy)|^2}|yf_\theta(y)|^2$$

and thus, since $h(0) = -\eta([0,\infty))$, $f_X(y) \sim \sigma^2|yf_\theta(y)/\eta([0,\infty))|^2$ as $y \to 0$.

If $\theta(t) = t^d\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $d \in (0, 1/2)$, the conclusion that $f_X(y) \to \infty$ as $y \to 0$ is an immediate consequence. Since $\gamma_X = \mathcal{F}[f_X]$ we cannot have $\gamma_X \in L^1$, as this would imply that $f_X$ is uniformly bounded (by Fourier inversion). □

*Proof of Theorem 3.11.* Let $\eta$ be given by (3.14), where $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$ are the roots of $Q$ (so that $Q(z) = \prod_{k=1}^q(z - \beta_k)$) and $\beta_{q+1} = \cdots = \beta_{p-1} = -1$ . Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} h(z) &= -z - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{zv}\eta(dv) \\ &= -z - \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j \prod_{k=1}^{j}\frac{1}{-z-\beta_k} \\ &= \frac{-z\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k) - \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j\prod_{k=j+1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k)}, \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, where we have used the convention $\prod_\emptyset = 1$. Choose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{p-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$P(-z) = -z\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k) - \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j\prod_{j=k+1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k).$$

Since $P$ and $Q$ are real polynomials,

$$\mathcal{L}[\eta](x) = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j\prod_{k=1}^{j}\frac{1}{(-x-\beta_k)} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j\prod_{k=j+1}^{p-1}(-x-\beta_k)}{Q(-x)\prod_{k=q+1}^{p-1}(-x-\beta_k)}, \quad x \le 0,$$

is real-valued and thus, $\eta$ is a real-valued measure. Since $P(-i\lambda) \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ by assumption, we also have $h(i\lambda) \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ with this choice of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{p-1}$, thus $h(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{a,0}}$ as well with suitably chosen $a < 0$. Furthermore, we find that

$$\mathcal{L}[\theta^{p-q-1}](z) = \frac{1}{-z(1-z)^{p-q-1}} = \frac{1}{-z\prod_{k=q+1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k)}$$

for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$, and therefore that

$$\mathcal{L}[\theta * x_0](z) = -\frac{z\mathcal{L}[\theta](z)}{h(z)} = \frac{Q(-z)}{P(-z)}$$

for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{a,0}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{L}[\theta * x_0](i\lambda) = \frac{Q(-i\lambda)}{P(-i\lambda)}$$

and consequently, according to Theorem 3.4, the unique solution to (3.15) is given by

$$Y_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta * x_0(t-u) dL_u. \tag{5.15}$$

By (3.13), $\theta * x_0$ is also the kernel driving the given CARMA$(p,q)$ process and the result follows. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.13.* Recall that $h(z) = -z - \int_{[0,\infty)} e^{zv}\eta(dv)$ and note that, for $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\det(-A_p - zI) &= -z\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k) - \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha_j \prod_{k=j+1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k) \\ &= h(z)\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $h(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, since the eigenvalues of $A_p$ have negative real part. Then $x_0$ is characterized by $\mathcal{L}[x_0](z) = 1/h(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,a}$ for any choice of $a < 0$, and we therefore just need to argue that

$$\mathcal{L}[e_p^T e^{A_p \cdot} e_p \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}](z) = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k)}{\det(-A_p - zI)}, \quad z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,a}.$$

This is indeed the case, since when $a < 0$ is sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}[e_p^T e^{A_p \cdot} e_p \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}](z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e_p^T A_p^k e_p \int_0^\infty \frac{t^k}{k!} e^{zt} dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{z}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e_p^T \left(\frac{-A_p}{z}\right)^k e_p \\ &= e_p^T(-A_p - zI)^{-1} e_p \\ &= \frac{1}{\det(-A_p - zI)} C_{p,p}\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \mathcal{S}_{-\infty,a}$, where $C_{p,p}$ is the $(p,p)$ cofactor of $-A_p - zI$. By the specific form of $A_p$ it follows that

$$C_{p,p} = \prod_{k=1}^{p-1}(-z-\beta_k),$$

which completes the first part of the proof. For the second part we note that, by Theorem 3.4, the solution to (3.1) with $\theta = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$ is given by

$$X_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x_0(t-u) dL_u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and since we have just argued that $x_0 = e_p^T e^{A_p \cdot} e_p \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$, the state-space representation follows. □

*Proof of Theorem 3.16.* We have $\mathbb{E}[|Z_u|] \leq a+b|u|$ for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ with suitably chosen $a, b > 0$ (see [1, Corollary A.3]), and this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}} |Z_u| \int_{[0,\infty)} |x_0(t-u-v)|\,|\eta|(dv)du\bigg] \\
&\quad \leq a|\eta|([0,\infty)) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x_0(u)|\,du + b\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u| \int_{[0,\infty)} |x_0(t-u-v)|\,|\eta|(dv)du \\
&\quad \leq \left(a|\eta|([0,\infty)) + b\int_{[0,\infty)} v|\eta|(dv)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x_0(u)|\,du \\
&\qquad + b|\eta|([0,\infty)) \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|t|+|u|)|x_0(u)|\,du.
\end{aligned}$$

This is finite by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_u \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(t-u-v)\,\eta(dv)du$ is therefore almost surely well-defined.

To argue that $X_t = Z_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_u \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(t-u-v)\,\eta(dv)du$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfies (3.1), let $s < t$ and note that by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} X_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du - \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} Z_{u-v}\,\eta(dv)\,du \\
&\quad = \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_r \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v-r-w)\,\eta(dw)\,dr\,\eta(dv)\,du \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_r \int_{[0,\infty)} \int_{s-r-w}^{t-r-w} \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\,\eta(dv)\,du\,\eta(dw)\,dr \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_r \int_{[0,\infty)} [x_0(t-r-w) - x_0(s-r-w)]\,\eta(dw)\,dr \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{[0,\infty)} Z_r[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t-r-w) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(s-r-w)]\,\eta(dw)\,dr \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z_r \int_{[0,\infty)} [x_0(t-r-w) - x_0(s-r-w)]\,\eta(dw)\,dr \\
&\quad - \int_s^t \int_{[0,\infty)} Z_{r-w}\,\eta(dw)\,dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we write

$$X_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (Z_t - Z_{t-u}) \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\,\eta(dv)\,du, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.16}$$

using Lemma 3.1. Since $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is continuous in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$, one shows that the process

$$X_t^n := \int_{-n}^n (Z_t - Z_{t-u}) \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(u-v)\,\eta(dv)\,du, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

is stationary by approximating it by Riemann sums in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$. Subsequently, due to the fact that $X_t^n \to X_t$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we conclude that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is stationary. The uniqueness claim can be verified by exactly the same arguments as used in the beginning of Theorem 3.4.

Finally, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that if $h(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}}$, $x_0(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$. As a consequence,

$$X_t = Z_t + \int_{-\infty}^{t} Z_u \int_{[0,\infty)} x_0(t-u-v)\eta(dv)du,$$

from which the causality property is immediate. □

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* First, observe that there exists $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{n} \theta * \phi^{*k} \to \psi$ in $L^2$ as $n \to \infty$. To see this, one can use that $L^2$ is complete and that the Fourier transform is an $L^2$ isometry. Moreover, since $|\phi|((-\infty, 0]) = 0$ and $\theta(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$, $\psi(t) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost all $t < 0$

Suppose now that we have a square integrable stationary solution $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. Then, using a stochastic Fubini (see [1, Theorem 3.1]), it follows that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X * \phi^{*n}(t) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\theta * L) * \phi^{*k}(t) \\ &= X * \phi^{*n}(t) + \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta * \phi^{*k} \right) * L(t) \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

for an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[X * \phi^{*n}(t)^2] \leq |\phi|(\mathbb{R})^{2n} \mathbb{E}[X_0^2] \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, and it therefore follows from (5.17) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta * \phi^{*k}(t-u) dL_u = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta * \phi^{*k} \right) * L(t) \to X_t$$

in $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta * \phi^{*k}(t - \cdot) \to \psi(t - \cdot)$ in $L^2$, it follows by isometry that $X_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t-u) dL_u$ almost surely.

Conversely, if one defines a square integrable stationary process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ by $X_t = \psi * L(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &X_t - \theta * L(t) \\ &\quad = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta * \phi^{*k} \right) * L(t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta * \phi^{*k} * L \right) * \phi(t) = X * \phi(t) \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, where the limits are in $L^2(\mathbb{P})$. Thus, $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies (4.1). □

*Remark* 5.5. Observe that the construction of $\psi$ in Theorem 4.1 is in line with the one in Theorem 2.2 in the sense that its Laplace transform takes the form $\mathcal{L}[\theta]/(1 - \mathcal{L}[\phi])$ on $\mathcal{S}_{-\infty,0}$.

# References


[1] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and A. Basse-O'Connor (2011). Quasi Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Bernoulli 17*(3), 916–941.

[2] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and N. Shephard (2001). Non-Gaussian Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol. 63*(2), 167–241.

[3] Basse-O'Connor, A., S.-E. Graversen, and J. Pedersen (2012). Multiparameter processes with stationary increments: spectral representation and integration. *Electron. J. Probab. 17*, no. 74, 21.

[4] Basse-O'Connor, A. and J. Rosiński (2013). Characterization of the finite variation property for a class of stationary increment infinitely divisible processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 123*(6), 1871–1890.

[5] Basse-O'Connor, A. and J. Rosiński (2016). On infinitely divisible semimartingales. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 164*(1-2), 133–163.

[6] Brockwell, P. and T. Marquardt (2005). Lévy-driven and fractionally integrated ARMA processes with continuous time parameter. *Statist. Sinica 15*(2), 477–494.

[7] Brockwell, P. J. (2001). Lévy-driven CARMA processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. 53*(1), 113–124. Nonlinear non-Gaussian models and related filtering methods (Tokyo, 2000).

[8] Brockwell, P. J. and R. A. Davis (2006). *Time series: theory and methods*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York. Reprint of the second (1991) edition.

[9] Brockwell, P. J., V. Ferrazzano, and C. Klüppelberg (2013). High-frequency sampling and kernel estimation for continuous-time moving average processes. *J. Time Series Anal. 34*(3), 385–404.

[10] Brockwell, P. J. and A. Lindner (2009). Existence and uniqueness of stationary Lévy-driven CARMA processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 119*(8), 2660–2681.

[11] Diekmann, O., S. A. van Gils, S. M. Verduyn Lunel, and H.-O. Walther (1995). *Delay equations*, Volume 110 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Functional, complex, and nonlinear analysis.

[12] Doetsch, G. (1937). Bedingungen für die Darstellbarkeit einer Funktion als Laplace-integral und eine Umkehrformel für die Laplace-Transformation. *Math. Z. 42*(1), 263–286.

[13] Dym, H. and H. P. McKean (1976). *Gaussian processes, function theory, and the inverse spectral problem*. New York: Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers]. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Vol. 31.

[14] Gushchin, A. A. and U. Küchler (2000). On stationary solutions of delay differential equations driven by a Lévy process. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 88*(2), 195–211.

[15] Jones, R. H. and L. M. Ackerson (1990). Serial correlation in unequally spaced longitudinal data. *Biometrika 77*(4), 721–731.

[16] Küchler, U. and B. Mensch (1992). Langevin's stochastic differential equation extended by a time-delayed term. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 40*(1-2), 23–42.

[17] Marquardt, T. and R. Stelzer (2007). Multivariate CARMA processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 117*(1), 96–120.

[18] Mohammed, S. E. A. and M. K. R. Scheutzow (1990). Lyapunov exponents and stationary solutions for affine stochastic delay equations. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 29*(2), 259–283.

[19] Musielak, J. (1983). *Orlicz spaces and modular spaces*, Volume 1034 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

[20] Protter, P. E. (2004). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations* (Second ed.), Volume 21 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.

[21] Rajput, B. S. and J. Rosiński (1989). Spectral representations of infinitely divisible processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 82*(3), 451–487.

[22] Reiß, M., M. Riedle, and O. van Gaans (2006). Delay differential equations driven by Lévy processes: stationarity and Feller properties. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 116*(10), 1409–1432.

[23] Rocha-Arteaga, A. and K. Sato (2003). *Topics in Infinitely Divisible Distributions and Lévy Processes*, Volume 17 of *Aportaciones Matemáticas: Investigación [Mathematical Contributions: Research]*. México: Sociedad Matemática Mexicana.

[24] Sato, K. (1999). *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*, Volume 68 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Translated from the 1990 Japanese original, Revised by the author.

[25] Schwartz, E. S. (1997). The stochastic behavior of commodity prices: Implications for valuation and hedging. *The Journal of Finance 52*(3), 923–973.

[26] Stelzer, R. (2011). Carma processes driven by non-gaussian noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.0155*.

[27] Todorov, V. and G. Tauchen (2006). Simulation methods for Lévy-driven continuous-time autoregressive moving average (CARMA) stochastic volatility models. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist. 24*(4), 455–469.